

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-14 are pending.

Claims 4 and 15-19 have been cancelled.

In the Office Action dated April 3, 2009, claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2; claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101; claims 1-2 and 4-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Ruffin (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,769).

ELECTION/RESTRICTION

Applicant confirms the election of the invention of Group I (claims 1-14). This election is made without traverse.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2

Claim 1 has been amended to further define “logical technology architecture.” Support for the amendment can be found in at least the following passages of the specification: p. 14, lines 21-32; p. 12, lines 20-28; and p. 9, line 12-p. 10, line 11. In view of the amendment, it is believed that this rejection of claim 1 has been overcome.

Claim 3 has been amended to further define “reference solution architecture.” Support for the amendment can be found in at least the following passage of the specification: p. 7, lines 9-19. In view of the amendment, it is believed that this rejection of claim 3 has been overcome.

Claim 8 has been amended to further add “processor” and to recite that the “reference solution architect” is executable on the processor. Support for the amendment can be found in at least the following passages of the specification: Fig. 3; p. 16, lines 5-25. In view of the amendment, it is believed that this rejection of claim 8 has been overcome.

Therefore, withdrawal of the § 112 rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that certain tasks are performed by a processor. Support for the amendment can be found in at least the following passages of the specification: Fig. 3; p. 16, lines 5- 25.

As noted above, claim 8 has been amended to recite a processor and that the reference solution architect is executable on the processor.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the § 101 rejection has been overcome. Therefore, withdrawal of the § 101 rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

It is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Ruffin. As purportedly disclosing the subject matter of claim 1, the Office Action cited the following passage of Ruffin: col. 6, lines 6-20. This passage of Ruffin refers to a provider having a particular product or solution that the provider will attempt to sell. Ruffin also notes that the provider will attempt to discern an appropriate customer set with which to match the proffered solution. The customer(s) will then be engaged by mass or direct mail or telephone solicitation, and the customer will then provide feedback based upon the customer's IT requirements. At this point, Ruffin states that it can be determined whether the proffered solution matches the customer's IT requirements.

Trying to determine whether or not a proffered solution matches a customer's requirements does not provide any teaching or hint of at least the following element of claim 1:

creating, by a processor, a logical technology architecture used to implement the business solution, wherein creating the logical technology architecture used to implement a reference solution comprises generalizing a plurality of technology products used to implement the business solution, and wherein generalizing the technology products comprises categorizing the technology products into logical technology components.

Specifically, there is no teaching in Ruffin of generalizing a plurality of technology products used to implement the business solution, where generalizing the technology products comprises categorizing the technology products into logical technology components.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Ruffin does not anticipate claim 1.

With respect to claim 8, column 6, lines 6-20, of Ruffin does not disclose the following subject matter of claim 8:

create a logical technology architecture used to implement the business solution, wherein the logical technology architecture provides a clustering of technologies into logical technology components to allow policies and strategies to be assigned to the logical technology components, wherein each logical technology component is a logical group of physical elements having a common technical characteristic.

Specifically, Ruffin provides no teaching of a logical technology architecture providing a clustering of technologies into logical technology components to allow policies and strategies to be assigned to the logical technology components, where each logical technology component is a logical group of physical elements having a common technical characteristic.

Therefore, Ruffin also does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 8.

Dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as corresponding independent claims.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees and/or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 (200901511-1).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 6, 2009

/Dan C. Hu/

Dan C. Hu
Registration No. 40,025
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
Telephone: (713) 468-8880
Facsimile: (713) 468-8883